

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-35, 37-47 and 49-72 are in the application. No claim has been allowed. Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are now amended.

§ 103 Rejections

In the last Office Action, claims 1, 9-11, 13, 21-23, 25, 33-35, 37, 45-47 and 49-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,634,197 to Paavonen and U.S. Patent 5,634,197 to Funk.

With respect to claims 1, 9-11, 13, 21-23, 25, 33-35, 37 and 45-47, representative claim 1 now recites (as amended):

1. A method for setting up a call within a wireless communication system, wherein the wireless communication system is deployed to provide call services to mobile stations (MS) operating in a private network, the method comprising the steps of ***at a mobile station:***
 - receiving a request at **the** mobile station to originate a call, ***the request specifying a phone number associated with a private service*** that is supported by the private network;
 - using the phone number to locate a service code in a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes*** wherein the service code ***identifies the private service;***
 - coding a service type field contained in a request message to indicate the private service identified by the located service code; and
 - sending the request message from the mobile station to base station equipment for call setup within the private network.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Paavonen does not inherently or explicitly disclose the Applicants' claimed combination of ***at the mobile station, using the phone number to locate a service code in a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes*** wherein the service code ***identifies the private service, coding a service type field in a request message to indicate the private service*** and ***sending the request message from the mobile station to base station equipment.***

First, Paavonen does not describe a request message that is sent from a mobile station to base station equipment at all. At column 1 lines 38 to 44, Paavonen merely discusses that it is

possible to control the operation of the network such that emergency servicing or other urgent calls are given high priority in a heavily loaded traffic situation.

Secondly, as explained in the Applicants' previous response, Paavonen actually describes a release message that is received by a subscriber station. See Paavonen, column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 10 and column 6, lines 63-65.

Nowhere does Paavonen suggest that the release message is sent from the subscriber station to the mobile exchange. This would make sense because in Paavonen's system, the mobile exchange issues the release message to cause the subscriber station to join the high-priority call. The subscriber system would not have any reason to send the release message because it does not become aware of the high-priority call until it receives the release message from the mobile exchange.

The Examiner's continued rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the Applicants' claims in light of Paavonen is therefore prima facie deficient and should be withdrawn for this reason alone. It is certainly traversed in light of Applicants' amendment above.

Furthermore, Funk also fails to teach specific steps as recited in Applicants' claims. Funk does describe the handling of calls in an Originating Switch 121 according to a Class of Service (COS) code in a telephone network. Applicants, on the other hand, now more clearly claim ***a request message that is sent from the mobile subscriber station to base station equipment***, to set up the special call. Moreover, the Applicants' claim, a process which occurs in the mobile unit, of using the phone number ***to locate a service code in a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes***. This service code is then used by the mobile station to identify a service when sending a connection request to the base station switch.

In the Applicants' invention, an SCS cause table 93 is maintained in the mobile subscriber unit (see the specification as filed on page 15 line 18 through page 16 line 6 and Fig. 7 steps 101 through 106. Thus, the Applicants' invention allows the subscriber unit to locate a service code in a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes, so that the mobile station itself can request setup of the call accordingly. Nowhere does Funk suggest that the mobile (subscriber) unit be aware of special service codes and/or use such codes in the process of setting up an emergency call.

At best, any combination of Paavonen and Funk thus still fails to disclose or suggest the advantages of involving the subscriber station in the process of setting up a high-priority call.

With respect to claims 49-72, representative claim 49 recites:

49. A method for setting up a call within a wireless communication system, wherein the wireless communication system is deployed to provide call services to mobile stations operating in a private network, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request message from a mobile station to reserve resources for a call, wherein the request message specifies a cause code that represents an establishment cause associated with the call for a private service that is supported by the private network;

granting resources to service the call depending upon the cause code specified in the request message and a state of other existing calls in the private network;

receiving a second request message from the mobile station containing a service type code associated with the private service;

using the service type code to determine if a user associated with the mobile station is authorized to request the private service; and

accepting the second request if the user is authorized to request the private service.

Claim 49 is thus directed to the corresponding process at the network side, which is also novel.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Paavonen fails to teach the Applicants' claimed combination of *receiving a second request message from the mobile station containing a service type code associated with the private service* and *using the service type code to determine if a user associated with the mobile station is authorized to request the private service*.

First, as noted above, Paavonen fails to inherently or explicitly disclose receiving request messages from a mobile station. At best, Paavonen describes a release message that is sent from an exchange and received by a mobile unit.

Second, Paavonen and Funk are silent with regards to determining if a user associated with a mobile station is authorized to request a private service. This makes sense because the Paavonen system sends a release message to a subscriber unit to cause the unit to join a high-priority call. In Funk, the subscriber unit is also not requesting that it join the high-priority call—it is being told by the exchange to join the high-priority call.

Therefore, there would be no need in Paavonen or Funk to authorize a request from the subscriber, since the subscriber is not sending a request at all.

For reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Paavonen and Funk fail to render claims 1, 9-11, 13, 21-23, 25, 33-35, 37, 45-47 and 49-72 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8, 12, 14-20, 24, 26-32, 36, 38-44 and 48 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable in further view of “GSM Standards 04.08 V7.1.2 Release 1998”, hereinafter “GSM 4.08”.

As noted above, Paavonen and Funk fail to disclose ***a mobile station with a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes***. “GSM 4.08” discloses a CM service request that contains a CM service type information element which is coded according to a requested service type. See “GSM 4.08”, Sections 9.2.9 and 10.5.3.3. However, “GSM 4.08” fails to provide any details as to how the service code is determined let alone describe ***a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes*** that is used ***to locate a service code given a phone number by a mobile station***. At best, table 10.5.91 describes the coding for various service types and their associated descriptions. Nowhere does the table contain information with regards to mapping phone numbers to service types.


For reasons set forth above, the Applicants also respectfully request that the above rejections to claims 2-8, 12, 14-20, 24, 26-32, 36, 38-44 and 48 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

David J. Thibodeau, Jr.

Registration No. 31,671

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 12/18/06